

Appl. No. 10/065,596
Amdt. Dated 5 August 2005
Reply to Office action of 23 May 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant appreciates the consideration shown by the Office, as evidenced by the Office Action, mailed on 23 May 2005. In that Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 25 and 26 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph; rejected claims 1-3, 5-7, 9, 13, 16, 20, 21, 22, 25, 26, and 27 under 35 USC 103(a) on Takakado et al. US5237260 (hereinafter "Takakado") in view of Julian et al. US5852558 (hereinafter "Julian"); rejected claim 4 under 35 USC 103(a) on Takakado and Julian and further in view of Lakey et al. US4883973; rejected claim 14 under 35 USC 103(a) on Takakado and Julian and further in view of Gels et al., US5903116; rejected claims 10, 12, 18, and 23 under 35 USC 103(a) on Takakado and Julian and further in view of Stanton et al. US4179729; rejected claims 8, 15, and 17 under 35 USC 103 (a) on Takakado and Julian and further in view of Nguyen US6067237; and rejected claims 11, 19 and 24 under 35 USC 103(a) on Takakado and Julian and further in view of ordinary skill in art.

After consideration of the Office Action, claims 1, 7, 21, and 26 have been amended, and claims 16-20, 25, and 27 have been canceled. Claims 1-15, 21-24, and 25 remain under consideration in the present application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application by the Examiner in light of the above amendments and the following remarks offered in response to the Office Action.

Claims fully comply with the requirements of 35 USC 112

Claim 25 has been canceled.

Claim 26 has been amended to more closely mirror the Specification and Drawings. Applicant thanks the Examiner for pointing out the earlier apparent typing error.

Applicant respectfully that claim 26, particularly as amended, is supported by the written description in compliance with 35 USC 112, first paragraph.

Claims define allowable subject matter over the applied art

Applicant notes the rejection of claims 1-3, 5-9, 13, 16, 20, 21, 22, 25, 26, and 27 under 35 USC 103(a) over Takakado and Julian. Applicant has canceled claims 16, 20, 25 and 27, and amended the remaining independent claims (claims 1 and 21) to more clearly indicate that one of the legs of the inverter is directly coupled to the neutral (as shown in Applicant's FIG. 1 for Example).

With respect to Takakado, as stated in the Office Action, Takakado does "not disclose explicitly showing that the inverter disclose having a neutral output." Each of the independent claims, as amended, has a corresponding recitation.

- claim 1: wherein in an operational mode, the combined rectifier and inverter provide generated power to the load port and generates a neutral output, wherein one of the legs of the inverter is electrically coupled directly to the neutral output.
- claim 21: a neutral output coupled directly to one of the legs of the inverter ...

Appl. No. 10/065,596
Amdt. Dated 5 August 2005
Reply to Office action of 23 May 2005

The Office Action has cited Julian with an assertion that Julian describes "on the leg of the inverter being connected to a neutral point 34 (see figure 1; column 6, lines 31-38)." However, Applicant submits that in Julian it is not the inverter being coupled to the neutral but instead the motor. As can be seen in FIG. 1 of Julian, all four legs of the inverter 20 are coupled to an LC filter 72 which in turn provides the three legs for the motor load 22. No leg is being described being coupled directly to a neutral output. In Column 6, lines 31-38, of Julian it is the motor windings which are described as being connected at the neutral point – not the inverter.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that a prima facie case of obviousness is not present for claims 1 and 21, particularly as amended, and that the applied references do not teach, suggest, or disclose (either individually or in combination) the recitations of independent claims 1 and 21 and of dependent claims 2-3, 5-9, 13, 22, and 26 which depend from one of the aforementioned independent claims.

The remaining dependent claims 4, 10-12, 14-15, 17-19, and 23-24 were each rejected under 35 USC 103(a) on Takakado and Julian in view of other references directed to aspects other than the neutral output. Claims 4, 10-12, 14-15, and 23-24 are likewise believed to be in condition for allowance regardless of whether the other references describe the other aspects. Claims 17-19 have been canceled.

Summary

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is needed to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

By Ann M. Agosti
Ann M. Agosti
Reg. No. 37,372
General Electric Company
Building K1, Room 3A66
One Research Circle
Niskayuna, New York 12309
Telephone: (518) 387-7713